

1
2
3 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

4 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

5
6 ADAVCO, INC.,

Case No. 1:23-cv-00695-JLT-SKO

7 Plaintiff,

**ORDER DENYING WITHOUT
PREJUDICE STIPULATED
PROTECTIVE ORDER**

8 v.

9 DEERTRAIL DEVELOPMENT LLC, et al., (Doc. 99)

10 Defendants.
11 _____/

12
13 **I. INTRODUCTION**

14 On August 20, 2025, the parties filed a request seeking Court approval of their proposed
15 Stipulated Protective Order. (Doc. 99.) The Court has reviewed this proposed stipulated protective
16 order and has determined that, in its current form, it fails to comply with the Local Rules and cannot
17 be granted. For the reasons set forth below, the Court DENIES *without prejudice* the parties' request
18 to approve the stipulation and protective order.

19 **A. The Protective Order Does Not Comply with Local Rule 141.1(c)**

20 The proposed protective order does not comply with Rule 141.1(c)(1) of the Local Rules of
21 the United States District Court, Eastern District of California. Local Rule 141.1(c)(1) requires “[a]
22 *description of the types of information eligible for protection under the order, with the description*
23 *provided in general terms sufficient to reveal the nature of the information.*” (emphasis added.)

24 The Stipulated Protective Order, in its current form, does not comply with this requirement.
25 It provides that “[e]xamples of confidential information . . . *include*” certain categories of materials.
26 (Doc. 43 at 3 (emphasis added).) With its inclusion of the words “examples” and “include,” the
27 proposed protective order fails to comply with Local Rule 141.1(c)(1), which requires “[a]
28 description of the types of information eligible for protection under the order, with the description

1 provided in general terms sufficient to reveal the nature of the information.” Without any additional
2 qualification or limitation to the words “examples” and “include,” or the removal thereof, the
3 proposed protective order does not sufficiently identify the types of information eligible for
4 protection.

5 **B. The Parties’ Stipulated Protective Order is Denied Without Prejudice**

6 The parties may re-file a revised proposed stipulated protective order that complies with
7 Local Rule 141.1(c)(1) and corrects the deficiency set forth in this order.

8 **II. CONCLUSION AND ORDER**

9 Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the parties’ request for approval of
10 their proposed Stipulated Protective Order (Doc. 99) is DENIED without prejudice to renewing the
11 request.

12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

13 Dated: **August 21, 2025**

/s/ Sheila K. Oberto
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE